

the Nazis did. They did so many horrific things, but they just wanted to destroy all culture, so any artwork that might be part of those claims would still be available.

With this finely and narrowly tailored amendment, we will have more opportunities to see art from Europe and from around the world. It is important to have exchanges of culture, so that people around the world understand the other cultures and so that it maybe makes the planet a little more safe. I support the bill as I understand that it still makes available redress for those who committed acts of expropriation during the Nazi era.

I thank Mr. CHABOT, who is my friend and who has done a great job, and we hope to keep the river flowing and the Delta Queen alive. I thank the Judiciary Committee chairman, BOB GOODLATTE, and our ranking member, the esteemed JOHN CONYERS, for their leadership.

I urge the House to pass the bill, and I would like to offer for the RECORD a letter from the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany, which speaks for itself, and for the American Jewish Congress in their stating that they would not oppose the passage of this bill.

CONFERENCE ON JEWISH MATERIAL  
CLAIMS AGAINST GERMANY, INC.  
New York, NY, December 19, 2013.

Mr. TIMOTHY RUB,  
President, Association of Art Museum Directors,  
The George D. Widener Director and CEO,  
Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia,  
PA.

DEAR MR. RUB, Anita Difanis has now sent us the language of the most recent draft of the immunity bill (the "Foreign Cultural Exchange Jurisdictional Immunity Clarification Act") that the AAMD is asking be introduced to the Congress. We have reviewed the points that concerned us, namely those in regard to Nazi Era claims.

While we are not persuaded of the need for this special legislation, we have no objection to it. The American Jewish Committee concurs with this view.

Sincerely yours,

GREG SCHNEIDER,  
Executive Vice-President.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I would like to begin by thanking Mr. CHABOT for introducing this legislation and by thanking Mr. CONYERS and Mr. COHEN for their support as well.

Madam Speaker, the Foreign Cultural Exchange Jurisdictional Immunity Clarification Act strengthens the ability of U.S. museums and educational institutions to borrow foreign government-owned artwork and cultural artifacts for temporary exhibition or display.

The United States has long recognized the importance of encouraging the cultural exchange of ideas through

exhibitions of artwork and other artifacts loaned from other countries.

These exchanges expose Americans to other cultures and foster understanding between people of different nationalities, languages, religions, and races. Unfortunately, the future success of cultural exchanges is severely threatened by a disconnect between the Immunity from Seizure Act and the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act.

Loans of artwork and cultural objects depend upon foreign lenders having confidence that the items they loan will be returned and that the loan will not open them up to lawsuits in U.S. courts.

For 40 years, the Immunity from Seizure Act provided foreign government lenders with this confidence. However, rulings in several recent Federal cases have undermined the protection provided by the Immunity from Seizure Act.

In these decisions, the Federal courts have held that the Immunity from Seizure Act does not preempt the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act. The effect has been to open foreign governments up to the jurisdiction of U.S. courts simply because they loaned artwork or cultural objects to an American museum or educational institution.

This has significantly impeded the ability of U.S. institutions to borrow foreign government-owned items. It has also resulted in cultural exchanges being curtailed as foreign government lenders have become hesitant to permit their cultural property to travel to the United States.

This bill addresses this situation. It provides that, if the State Department grants immunity to a loan of artwork or cultural objects from—under the Immunity from Seizure Act, then the loan cannot subject a foreign government to the jurisdiction of U.S. courts under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act.

This is very narrow legislation. It only applies to one of the many grounds for jurisdiction under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act. Moreover, it requires the State Department to grant the artwork immunity under the Immunity from Seizure Act before its provisions apply, and in order to preserve the claims of victims of the Nazi government and its allies during World War II, the bill has an exception for claims brought by these victims.

If we want to encourage foreign governments to continue to lend artwork and other artifacts to American museums and educational institutions, we must enact this legislation.

Without the protections this bill provides, foreign governments will avoid the risk of lending their cultural items to American institutions, and the American public will lose the opportunity to view and appreciate these cultural objects from abroad.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, in closing, I just want to comment that Mr. GOODLATTE's committee has now pro-

duced this bill and the next bill, the Lummis-Cohen bill, and we came together to work against sex trafficking last week.

So the Judiciary Committee, under the leadership of Mr. GOODLATTE, is starting to produce a lot of good, bipartisan legislation. I commend him for that work, and I hope we see more of it.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will be very brief. I would like to, first of all, thank the Cincinnati Museum Center and the Cincinnati Art Museum for bringing this matter to my attention.

I want to particularly thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for his leadership on this bill, as well as to thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. GOODLATTE, and also the ranking member, Mr. CONYERS, for their leadership.

Without having any additional speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4292.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

## OPEN BOOK ON EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2919) to amend titles 5 and 28, United States Code, to require annual reports to Congress on, and the maintenance of databases on, awards of fees and other expenses to prevailing parties in certain administrative proceedings and court cases to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2919

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Open Book on Equal Access to Justice Act".

### SEC. 2. MODIFICATION OF EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE PROVISIONS.

(a) AGENCY PROCEEDINGS.—Section 504 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by striking "United States Code";

(2) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (i); and

(3) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e)(1) The Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States, after consultation with the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration, shall report to the Congress, not later than March 31 of each year, on the amount of fees and other expenses awarded during the preceding fiscal year pursuant to this section. The report shall describe the number, nature, and amount of the awards, the claims involved in the controversy, and any other relevant information that may aid the Congress in evaluating the scope and impact of such awards. The report shall be made available to the public online.

“(2)(A) The report required by paragraph (1) shall account for all payments of fees and other expenses awarded under this section that are made pursuant to a settlement agreement, regardless of whether the settlement agreement is sealed or otherwise subject to nondisclosure provisions.

“(B) The disclosure of fees and other expenses required under subparagraph (A) does not affect any other information that is subject to nondisclosure provisions in the settlement agreement.

“(f) The Chairman of the Administrative Conference shall create and maintain online a searchable database containing the following information with respect to each award of fees and other expenses under this section:

“(1) The case name and number of the adversary adjudication, if available, hyperlinked to the case, if available.

“(2) The name of the agency involved in the adversary adjudication.

“(3) A description of the claims in the adversary adjudication.

“(4) The name of each party to whom the award was made.

“(5) The amount of the award.

“(6) The basis for the finding that the position of the agency concerned was not substantially justified.

“(g) The online searchable database described in subsection (f) may not reveal any information the disclosure of which is prohibited by law or court order.

“(h) The head of each agency shall provide to the Chairman of the Administrative Conference in a timely manner all information requested by the Chairman to comply with the requirements of subsections (e), (f), and (g).”

(b) COURT CASES.—Section 2412(d) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5)(A) The Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States shall submit to the Congress, not later than March 31 of each year, a report on the amount of fees and other expenses awarded during the preceding fiscal year pursuant to this subsection. The report shall describe the number, nature, and amount of the awards, the claims involved in each controversy, and any other relevant information that may aid the Congress in evaluating the scope and impact of such awards. The report shall be made available to the public online.

“(B)(i) The report required by subparagraph (A) shall account for all payments of fees and other expenses awarded under this subsection that are made pursuant to a settlement agreement, regardless of whether the settlement agreement is sealed or otherwise subject to nondisclosure provisions.

“(ii) The disclosure of fees and other expenses required under clause (i) does not affect any other information that is subject to nondisclosure provisions in the settlement agreement.

“(C) The Chairman of the Administrative Conference shall include and clearly identify in the annual report under subparagraph (A), for each case in which an award of fees and other expenses is included in the report—

“(i) any amounts paid from section 1304 of title 31 for a judgment in the case;

“(ii) the amount of the award of fees and other expenses; and

“(iii) the statute under which the plaintiff filed suit.

“(6) The Chairman of the Administrative Conference shall create and maintain online a searchable database containing the following information with respect to each award of fees and other expenses under this subsection:

“(A) The case name and number, hyperlinked to the case, if available.

“(B) The name of the agency involved in the case.

“(C) The name of each party to whom the award was made.

“(D) A description of the claims in the case.

“(E) The amount of the award.

“(F) The basis for the finding that the position of the agency concerned was not substantially justified.

“(7) The online searchable database described in paragraph (6) may not reveal any information the disclosure of which is prohibited by law or court order.

“(8) The head of each agency shall provide to the Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States in a timely manner all information requested by the Chairman to comply with the requirements of paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), including the Attorney General of the United States and the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.”

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 2412 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(3), by striking “United States Code,”; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking “of section 2412 of title 28, United States Code,” and inserting “of this section”; and

(B) by striking “of such title” and inserting “of this title”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall first apply with respect to awards of fees and other expenses that are made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) INITIAL REPORTS.—The first reports required by section 504(e) of title 5, United States Code, and section 2412(d)(5) of title 28, United States Code, shall be submitted not later than March 31 of the calendar year following the first calendar year in which a fiscal year begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) ONLINE DATABASES.—The online databases required by section 504(f) of title 5, United States Code, and section 2412(d)(6) of title 28, United States Code, shall be established as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, but in no case later than the date on which the first reports under section 504(e) of title 5, United States Code, and section 2412(d)(5) of title 28, United States Code, are required to be submitted under paragraph (2) of this subsection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 2919, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to begin by thanking Representative CYNTHIA LUMMIS and the Constitution Subcommittee ranking member again, Mr. COHEN from Tennessee, for introducing this important government transparency legislation.

Every year, pursuant to the Equal Access to Justice Act, the Federal Government, through settlement or court order, pays millions of dollars in legal fees and costs to parties to lawsuits and administrative adjudications that involve the Federal Government.

However, despite the large number of taxpayer dollars paid out each year through the Act, the Federal Government no longer comprehensively keeps track of the amount of fees and other expenses awarded, why these fees and expenses were awarded, and to whom these costs were awarded.

This is because, in 1995, Congress repealed the Department of Justice's reporting requirements and defunded the Administrative Conference of the United States, which is the agency charged with reporting this basic information to Congress—to us.

The Administrative Conference was reestablished in 2010, but the requirements to report the fee and cost payments have not been reenacted. Accordingly, there has been no official governmentwide accounting of this information since fiscal year 1994, almost 20 years ago.

This lack of transparency is troubling, given that the Equal Access to Justice Act is considered by many to be the most important Federal fee-shifting statute. Fundamentally, the Act recognizes that there is an enormous disparity of resources between the Federal Government and individuals and small businesses that seek to challenge the Federal actions.

Congress enacted the Equal Access to Justice Act to provide individuals, small businesses, and small nonprofit groups with financial assistance to bring suit against the Federal Government or to defend themselves from lawsuits brought by the Federal Government.

As the Supreme Court has noted, the Act was adopted with the “specific purpose . . . of eliminating for the average person the financial disincentive to challenge unreasonable governmental actions.”

But how can we know if the Act is working well toward this end if we have no data on awards?

Without the data, this bill requires the Administrative Conference to compile and report that we have nothing more than anecdotal evidence as to whether the Act is working.

The legislation we are considering today will end this lack of transparency and will restore the reporting

requirements that were repealed back in 1995.

I want to, once again, thank Representatives LUMMIS and COHEN for introducing this bill. It is good legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2919, the Open Book on Equal Access to Justice Act, also known as the Longworth 1004 Act.

This bipartisan legislation makes a modest, but important improvement to the Equal Access to Justice Act, also known as EAJA. That Act, which was enacted in 1980, allows parties, under certain circumstances, to be awarded attorneys' fees and court costs when they prevail in litigation against the United States.

EAJA enables ordinary citizens, such as veterans, senior citizens, and advocates for clean air and clean water, to fight unfair or illegal government actions without fear of the court costs involved.

Over the years, the Act has succeeded, but since 1995, when certain reporting requirements were eliminated, we have had no reliable data on how much money the government has awarded in these proceedings. The public has a right to know how taxpayer funds are used, and Congress ought to be able to assess the impact and effectiveness of EAJA.

□ 1800

To address this failing, H.R. 2919 would require the Administrative Conference of the United States, or ACUS, a highly respected nonpartisan agency, to prepare an annual report for Congress on the fees and costs awarded in these cases. The reports would also include the number and nature of the claims involved.

The Conference would also be required to establish a publicly accessible, searchable database with this information, as well as the case name, the agency involved, and the basis of the award.

I am very pleased to sponsor this bill along with the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS), who has done a great job bringing this to this floor, shepherding it through to, hopefully, passage and becoming law. We have worked on a bipartisan basis to address this issue.

H.R. 2919 represents a compromise with respect to a broader bill related to EAJA which Mrs. LUMMIS previously introduced. It is an excellent example of what happens when there is bipartisan cooperation.

This legislation will promote greater transparency with respect to our government and provide valuable information for Congress and our citizens. It exemplifies the bipartisan cooperation we are capable of in this Chamber.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2919, the Open Book on Equal Access to Justice Act. I want to thank the ranking member, STEVE COHEN, for joining me in introducing this legislation. The gentleman from Tennessee was the person from whom I inherited the hallowed halls of Longworth 1004. Our staff shared duties, including each other's phone duties when meetings were being held in our offices. It was a great partnership and a wonderful bipartisan relationship that I have enjoyed ever since coming to Congress.

I deeply thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his friendship. He was instrumental in securing bipartisan support for passage of H.R. 2919 through the Judiciary Committee.

H.R. 2919 reinstates the tracking and reporting of attorneys fees paid out by the Federal Government under the Equal Access to Justice Act, also known as EAJA.

EAJA was first enacted in 1980, with the goal of protecting small businesses and other citizens facing unreasonable government action. It was meant to address the David and Goliath situation that exists when a citizen has to go to court against the Federal Government's vast financial and legal resources.

Consistent with this theme, EAJA was amended in 1985 to facilitate its application to Social Security claims. It was again amended in 1992 to include claims before the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims.

EAJA has been subject to numerous reviews and revisions over the years to keep it up to date. Its requirement for agencies to track and report on attorneys' fees helped inform Congress in its past efforts to improve the law. This transparency was also a safeguard for the Federal taxpayers who finance the law.

Prior to 1995, EAJA payments trickled out at a rate of about \$3 million annually. But since tracking and reporting requirements were eliminated in 1995, EAJA has operated in the dark.

As a Government Accountability Office report made clear, most agencies do not track payments—and won't—unless Congress gives them direction to do so. Madam Speaker, that is why we are here today.

As the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), mentioned, we only have anecdotal evidence as to how much we are spending on attorney fees, which agencies pay out the fees, and for what types of claims. We need transparency to better monitor this law moving forward.

H.R. 2919 both reinstates transparency and improves it by requiring the information be posted online in a searchable database. We owe this to the small businesses, veterans, Social Security claimants, and others who rely on EAJA for their once-in-a-life-

time court battles with the Federal Government. And we owe it to the hardworking taxpayers who are financing this law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CHABOT. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I deeply appreciate it.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2919.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Speaker, in great appreciation and deference to the gentleman on the Judiciary Committee, and especially to my cosponsor, Mr. COHEN, I gratefully acknowledge his cosponsorship—he supported this bill—and the hard work of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS), as well as the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for their bipartisan support in this most important bill.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2919, the Open Book on Equal Access to Justice Act, which increases transparency and works to ensure that the Equal Access to Justice Act, or EAJA, does what it was always intended to do: protect citizens and small businesses against the limited resources of the Federal Government when they have to go to court.

This law was written to give individuals like our veterans, seniors, and small businesses a way to dispute unfair treatment by the government. However, the original intent of EAJA has been lost in a sea of habitual litigation, especially when it involves the management of our natural resources and our public lands and projects that bring much-needed jobs and tax revenues to local communities. Much of this litigation is awarded with millions of hard-earned taxpayer dollars. That is unacceptable.

In Montana, we have seen firsthand the consequences of some of this litigation. Montanans rely on healthy forests and rangelands for their livelihoods. Loggers, ranchers, miners, outfitters and guides, and others, rely on healthy land management to feed their families.

In recent decades, inflexible Federal policies and unrelenting appeals and lawsuits have imposed a huge administrative burden on our Federal agencies, limited our mills' access to timber, and ultimately resulted in the mismanagement of our forests, leaving our homes and businesses at risk for wildfire and crippling job growth in the timber industry.

In Montana, we used to have 30 sawmills. Today, we have just nine. Collaborative projects that the Montana

timber industry and conservation leaders have spent countless hours negotiating are sometimes stopped in court. True conservation is on-the-ground stewardship by hardworking individuals directly reliant on the land. It is not done in the courtroom.

At the very least, the American people ought to know how much of their hard-earned tax dollars are going towards these litigants and the information that led to their claims against the Federal agency. The Open Book on Equal Access to Justice Act will provide that much-needed transparency which, hopefully, can limit these lawsuits and help save hundreds of American jobs.

I urge support for H.R. 2919.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of the Open Book on Equal Access to Justice Act, and I thank the gentlelady from Wyoming and the gentleman from Tennessee, my friend on the Judiciary Committee, for their hard work on this. Also, Mr. CHABOT.

There are a lot of times we get to disagree on things, but this is one we can come together and agree on. And that is a good thing for not only our committee, it is good for the American people.

The Equal Access to Justice Act supports one of our Nation's founding principles—equal justice under the law—by making our legal system more accessible for all Americans.

Today's bipartisan legislation simply ensures that Equal Access to Justice programs observe commonsense reporting and transparency requirements. This good government bill will ensure proper oversight of this program by providing both Congress and the public the data they need to make informed decisions.

The original Equal Access to Justice Act rightfully included tracking and reporting requirements concerning payments made under the authority of this law. Taxpayers should not be on the hook for untold amounts of attorneys' fees for special interest groups that sue the Federal Government to change policy without public input.

My constituents simply don't believe their hard-earned money should go to groups that push their agenda through litigation instead of the regular legislative process. Congress has a responsibility to ensure that the Federal Government is truly working on behalf of the Americans who fund it. The Open Book on Equal Access to Justice Act will help ensure that the original law is working as Congress intended.

With greater transparency through reporting, the American people will have greater confidence that their tax dollars are being well spent.

I would like to thank again the sponsors for offering this. I am proud to be an original cosponsor on this.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, having no further speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2919.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motions to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4292 and H.R. 3584, as amended; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, in each case by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

## FOREIGN CULTURAL EXCHANGE JURISDICTIONAL IMMUNITY CLARIFICATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4292) to amend chapter 97 of title 28, United States Code, to clarify the exception to foreign sovereign immunity set forth in section 1605(a)(3) of such title, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 4, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

YEAS—388

Amodei	Ellison	LaMalfa
Bachus	Engel	Lamborn
Barber	Enyart	Lance
Barletta	Eshoo	Langevin
Barr	Esty	Larsen (WA)
Barrow (GA)	Farenthold	Larson (CT)
Barton	Farr	Latham
Bass	Fattah	Latta
Beatty	Fincher	Lee (CA)
Becerra	Fitzpatrick	Levin
Benishek	Fleischmann	Lipinski
Bentivolio	Fleming	LoBiondo
Bera (CA)	Flores	Loeb sack
Bilirakis	Forbes	Lofgren
Bishop (GA)	Fortenberry	Long
Bishop (NY)	Foster	Lowenthal
Bishop (UT)	Fox	Lowe
Black	Frankel (FL)	Lucas
Blackburn	Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer
Bonamici	Frelinghuysen	Lujan Grisham
Boustany	Fudge	(NM)
Brady (PA)	Gabbard	Lujan, Ben Ray
Brady (TX)	Gallego	(NM)
Braley (IA)	Garamendi	Lummis
Bridenstine	Garcia	Lynch
Brooks (AL)	Gardner	Maffei
Brown (GA)	Garrett	Maloney,
Brown (FL)	Gerlach	Carolyn
Brownley (CA)	Gibbs	Maloney, Sean
Buchanan	Gibson	Marchant
Bucshon	Gohmert	Marino
Burgess	Goodlatte	Massie
Bustos	Gosar	Matheson
Byrne	Gowdy	Matsui
Calvert	Graves (GA)	McCarthy (CA)
Camp	Graves (MO)	McCarthy (NY)
Cantor	Grayson	McCauley
Capito	Green, Al	McClintock
Capps	Green, Gene	McCollum
Capuano	Griffith (VA)	McDermott
Cárdenas	Grijalva	McGovern
Carney	Grimm	McHenry
Carter	Guthrie	McIntyre
Cartwright	Hahn	McKeon
Cassidy	Hall	McKinley
Castor (FL)	Hanabusa	McMorris
Castro (TX)	Hanna	Rodgers
Chabot	Harper	McNerney
Chaffetz	Harris	Meadows
Chu	Hartzer	Meehan
Ciçilline	Hastings (FL)	Meeks
Clark (MA)	Hastings (WA)	Meng
Clarke (NY)	Heck (NV)	Mica
Clay	Heck (WA)	Michaud
Cleaver	Hensarling	Miller (FL)
Clyburn	Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)
Coffman	Higgins	Miller, George
Cohen	Himes	Moore
Cole	Hinojosa	Moran
Collins (GA)	Holding	Mullin
Collins (NY)	Holt	Mulvaney
Conaway	Honda	Murphy (PA)
Connolly	Horsford	Nadler
Conyers	Hoyer	Napolitano
Cook	Hudson	Negrete McLeod
Cooper	Huelskamp	Neugebauer
Costa	Huffman	Noem
Cotton	Huizenga (MI)	Nolan
Courtney	Hultgren	Nugent
Cramer	Hunter	Nunes
Crenshaw	Hurt	O'Rourke
Crowley	Israel	Olson
Cuellar	Issa	Owens
Culberson	Jackson Lee	Palazzo
Cummings	Jeffries	Pallone
Daines	Jenkins	Pascarell
Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Pastor (AZ)
Davis, Danny	Johnson (OH)	Paulsen
Davis, Rodney	Johnson, E. B.	Pearce
DeFazio	Johnson, Sam	Pelosi
DeGette	Jolly	Perlmutter
Delaney	Jordan	Perry
DeLauro	Kaptur	Peters (CA)
DelBene	Keating	Peters (MI)
Denham	Kelly (IL)	Peterson
Dent	Kelly (PA)	Petri
DeSantis	Kennedy	Pingree (ME)
DesJarlais	Kildee	Pitts
Diaz-Balart	Kilmer	Pocan
Dingell	Kind	Poe (TX)
Doggett	King (IA)	Polis
Doyle	Kinzinger (IL)	Pompeo
Duckworth	Kirkpatrick	Posey
Duncan (SC)	Kline	Price (GA)
Duncan (TN)	Kuster	Price (NC)
Edwards	Labrador	Quigley